



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/806,182	03/23/2004	Tarou Takagi	62758-071	1997
7590	06/01/2007		EXAMINER	
McDermott, Will & Emery 600 13th Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20005-3096			NGUYEN, PHU K	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2628	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/01/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/806,182	TAKAGI, TAROU
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Phu K. Nguyen	2628

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 March 2007.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.      2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 23,30 and 31 is/are pending in the application.
  - 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 23,30 and 31 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**PHU K. NGUYEN  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
GROUP 2300**

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by WAINWRIGHT (6,889,374).

As per claim 23, Wainwright teaches the claimed “engineering system that employs a solid shape describing method for describing a solid model existing in a three-dimensional space with use of a bit map, said system comprising: “a function for defining a plurality of different coordinate systems used for said solid model” (Wainwright, world coordinate; column 5, lines 47-58); “a function for defining that an area occupied by one of said plurality of different coordinate systems overlaps with a part or whole of an area occupied by another coordinate system” (Wainwright, the local coordinates, column 7, lines 62-67); and “a display unit for displaying a solid shape by describing its solid shape data with use of said plurality of different coordinate systems” (Wainwright, display 412; figure 4).

#### RESPONSE TO APPLICANT'S ARGUMENTS.

Applicant's arguments filed on March 8, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive.

Applicant argues that Wainwright does not disclose the use of a bitmap which is not correct. First, the claimed feature of "a bitmap" only presents in the preamble, and does not constitute any specific function or relation in the body of the claim. Furthermore, Wainwright uses of the scripting language only initially to generate, through the processor 108, the graphical object in the bitmap frames in the screen file (Wainwright, column 4, lines 46-49, 53-55) stored in the memory 406 or 410 for displaying in the CRT display 412 (column 9, lines 10-12, figure 4). It is clear that the image frame prepared for displaying in the CRT 412 is in the bit map form of a display frame (column 5, lines 29-46).

Applicant argues that Wainwright does not teach "converting a solid model to . solid shape data" which is clearly not correct because Wainwright's scripting language, which is used to describe a solid model, is converted by the processor 108, to a solid shape, stored in the displaying frames of the screen file (Wainwright, column 4, lines 52-55).

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 30-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claims 30, and similar claim 31, it is unclear as how the information "that denotes whether the cell's center exists inside or outside the subject solid" is related or contributes to the other claimed features.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 30-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over WAINWRIGHT (6,889,374) in view of PERRY et al. (6,917,369).

Claim 30 is similar to claim 23, and adds the cell information which "denotes whether the cell's center exists inside or outside the subject solid." Wainwright does not teach the claimed cell information. However, such claimed cell information is well known in the art (Perry, column 21, line 51 to column 22, line 42). It would have been obvious, in view of Perry, to configure Wainwright's system as claimed because the cell information is used, on a world coordinate system, to describe the object in the display screen of a local coordinate system (Perry, column 5, lines 10-14).

Claim 31 claims a method based on the system of claim 30, it is rejected under the same reason.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phu K. Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272 7645. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Razavi can be reached on (571) 272 7664. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Phu K. Nguyen  
May 19, 2007

*Phu Nguyen*  
PHU.K. NGUYEN  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
GROUP 2300